

COLIN O'BRIEN, SB No. 309413
cobrien@earthjustice.org
ADRIENNE BLOCH, SB No. 215471
abloch@earthjustice.org
HEATHER M. LEWIS, SB No. 291933
hlewis@earthjustice.org
EARTHJUSTICE
50 California Street, Suite 500
San Francisco, CA 94111
Tel. (415) 217-2000 / Fax. (415) 217-2040

*Attorneys for Proposed Defendant-Intervenors
Sierra Club and San Francisco Baykeeper*

JESSICA YARNALL LOARIE, SB No. 252282
jessica.yarnall@sierraclub.org
JOANNE SPALDING, SB No. 169560
joanne.spalding@sierraclub.org
SIERRA CLUB
2101 Webster Street, Suite 1300
Oakland, CA 94612
Tel. (415) 977-5636 / Fax. (510) 208-3140

*Attorneys for Proposed Defendant-Intervenors
Sierra Club*

(List of Counsel continued on next page)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

OAKLAND BULK & OVERSIZED TERMINAL,
LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF OAKLAND,

Defendant,

and

SIERRA CLUB and SAN FRANCISCO
BAYKEEPER,

Proposed Defendant-Intervenors.

Case No. 16-cv-7014-VC

**SIERRA CLUB'S AND SAN FRANCISCO
BAYKEEPER'S [PROPOSED] ANSWER**

1 DANIEL P. SELMI, SB No. 67481
dselmi@aol.com
2 919 Albany Street
Los Angeles, CA 92662
3 Tel. (213) 736-1098 / Fax. (949) 675-9871

4 *Attorney for Proposed Defendant-Intervenor*
Sierra Club
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Sierra Club and San Francisco Baykeeper (collectively, “Defendant-Intervenors”) hereby
2 respond to the allegations in Plaintiff’s Complaint (ECF #6). The numbered paragraphs in this
3 answer correspond to the numbered paragraphs of the Complaint.

4 NATURE OF THE ACTION

5 1. The allegations in paragraph 1 are characterizations of Plaintiff’s case which require
6 no response. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the
7 allegations.

8 2. The allegations in paragraph 2 are characterizations of Plaintiff’s case which require
9 no response. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the
10 allegations.

11 3. Defendant-Intervenors admit there is a Development Agreement dated July 16, 2013.
12 Defendant-Intervenors deny Plaintiff’s characterizations of the Development Agreement since the
13 Agreement speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.

14 4. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
15 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 4 and therefore deny them.

16 5. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
17 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 5 and therefore deny them.

18 6. The allegations in paragraph 6 are too vague to permit a specific response. On that
19 basis, Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 6.

20 7. Defendant-Intervenors deny Plaintiff’s characterizations of environmental groups’
21 opposition to coal and petcoke. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to
22 form a belief as to the truth of the allegations about coal handling and operations at the Terminal and
23 therefore deny them. Defendant-Intervenors deny Plaintiff’s characterizations of the City’s health
24 and safety hearing process.

25 8. Defendant-Intervenors admit that Oakland passed a coal and petcoke Ordinance and
26 Resolution in 2016. Defendant-Intervenors deny Plaintiff’s characterizations of the Ordinance and
27 Resolution, as these documents speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their contents.

11	14.	Defendant-Intervenors admit paragraph 14.
12	15.	Defendant-Intervenors admit paragraph 15.

14 16. The allegations in paragraph 16 are conclusions of law to which no response is
15 required. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the
16 allegations.

17 17. The allegations in paragraph 17 are conclusions of law to which no response is
18 required. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the
19 allegations.

18. Defendant-Intervenors admit that the City of Oakland is within this District. The remaining allegations in paragraph 18 are conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations.

19. The allegations in paragraph 19 are conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations.

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

20. The allegations in paragraph 20 are conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

21. Defendant-Intervenors admit that the area known as the Gateway Development Area was formerly the Oakland Army Base, and that ownership of the Oakland Army Base was transferred in 1999. Defendant-Intervenors deny that the land was transferred directly to the City of Oakland.

22. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 22 and therefore deny them.

23. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 23 and therefore deny them.

24. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 24 and therefore deny them.

25. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 25 and therefore deny them.

26. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 26 and therefore deny them.

27. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding noticed public hearings and therefore deny them. Defendant-Intervenors admit the remaining allegations in paragraph 27.

28. Defendant-Intervenors admit the first sentence of paragraph 28. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remainder of the allegations in paragraph 28 and therefore deny them.

29. The allegations in paragraph 29 are characterizations of the DA and LDDA. Those documents speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these allegations.

1 30. The allegations in paragraph 30 are characterizations of the DA, the LDDA, and the
2 Assistant City Administrator's February 3, 2016 report. Those documents speak for themselves and
3 are the best evidence of their contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these allegations.

4 31. The allegations in paragraph 31 are characterizations of the DA. The DA speaks for
5 itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these
6 allegations

7 32. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
8 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 32 and therefore deny them.

9 33. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
10 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 33 and therefore deny them.

11 34. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
12 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 34 and therefore deny them.

13 35. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
14 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 35 and therefore deny them. Insofar as paragraph 35
15 contains characterizations of the DA, the DA speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents;
16 accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these allegations.

17 36. The allegations in paragraph 36 are Plaintiff's characterizations of the Oakland City
18 Council's health and safety hearing process and the Council's review of the evidence from these
19 hearings. Defendant-Intervenors deny these allegations.

20 a. Defendant-Intervenors admit that Resolution No. 85054 was passed on June
21 17, 2014 but deny the remainder of the allegations in paragraph 36(a).

22 b. Defendant-Intervenors admit the existence and content of the press release
23 alleged in paragraph 36(b), but lack sufficient knowledge or information to
24 form a belief as to the date on which it was published.

25 c. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a
26 belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 36(c) and therefore deny
27 them.

28 d. Defendant-Intervenors admit the allegations in paragraph 36(d).

1 37. Defendant-Intervenors admit that a public health and safety hearing was held in
2 September 2015. Defendant-Intervenors deny Plaintiff's characterization of the hearing as a "sham"
3 public process, and deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 37.

4 38. Defendant-Intervenors admit that Bay Area Air Quality Management District
5 (BAAQMD) regulates non-vehicular sources of emissions into the air in the Bay Area. Defendants
6 lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations
7 in paragraph 38 and therefore deny them.

8 39. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
9 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 39 and therefore deny them.

10 40. The allegations in paragraph 40 are characterizations of a City Council resolution
11 passed on May 3, 2016. That document speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents;
12 accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these allegations.

13 41. Defendant-Intervenors admit City Council retained Environmental Science
14 Associates ("ESA") but deny Plaintiff's characterizations that ESA was retained "to selectively
15 review the record" or that ESA was supposed "to create findings that would appear to support a
16 finding of 'health and/or safety impacts.'"

17 42. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 42.

18 43. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
19 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 43 and therefore deny them.

20 44. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
21 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 44 and therefore deny them.

22 45. Defendant-Intervenors admit ESA issued a Report on or around June 23, 2016.

23 46. Defendant-Intervenors admit that the City of Oakland released proposed drafts of the
24 Ordinance and Resolution on June 24, 2016, and that City staff prepared an Agenda Report.
25 Defendant-Intervenors deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 46, including Plaintiff's
26 characterizations of the Agenda Report. The Agenda Report speaks for itself and is the best evidence
27 of its contents.

1 47. Defendant-Intervenors admit that City Council held a public hearing on June 27,
2 2016, at which City Council adopted the Resolution and held a first vote on the Ordinance.
3 Defendant-Intervenors deny that the Ordinance was adopted on June 27, 2016, and deny the
4 remaining allegations in paragraph 47.

5 48. The allegations in paragraph 48 are characterizations of the ESA Report. That
6 document speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-
7 Intervenors deny these allegations.

8 49. The allegations in paragraph 49 are characterizations of the ESA Report. That
9 document speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-
10 Intervenors deny these allegations.

11 50. The allegations in paragraph 50 are characterizations of the ESA Report. That
12 document speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-
13 Intervenors deny these allegations.

14 51. The allegations in paragraph 51 are too vague to permit a specific response. On that
15 basis, Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 51.

16 52. The allegations in paragraph 52 are characterizations of the ESA Report and City
17 Council's administrative record. Those documents speak for themselves and are the best evidence of
18 their contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these allegations.

19 53. The allegations in paragraph 53 are characterizations of the ESA Report. That
20 document speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-
21 Intervenors deny these allegations.

22 54. The allegations in paragraph 54 are characterizations of the ESA Report. That
23 document speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-
24 Intervenors deny these allegations.

25 55. The allegations in paragraph 55 are characterizations of the ESA Report. That
26 document speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-
27 Intervenors deny these allegations.

28 56. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 56.

1 57. The allegations in paragraph 57 are characterizations of the ESA Report. That
2 document speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-
3 Intervenor deny these allegations.

4 58. The allegations in paragraph 58 are characterizations of the ESA Report. That
5 document speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-
6 Intervenor deny these allegations.

7 59. Defendant-Intervenor deny the allegations in paragraph 59.

8 60. The allegations in paragraph 60 are characterizations of the ESA Report. That
9 document speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-
10 Intervenor deny these allegations.

11 61. Defendant-Intervenor lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
12 the truth of the allegations in the first sentence of paragraph 61 and therefore deny them. The
13 remaining allegations in paragraph 61 are characterizations of the ESA Report. That document
14 speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenor deny
15 these allegations.

16 62. Defendant-Intervenor admit the first sentence of paragraph 62. The remaining
17 allegations in paragraph 62 are characterizations of the ESA Report. That document speaks for itself
18 and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenor deny these allegations.

19 63. Defendant-Intervenor admit that the Long Beach terminal is enclosed in some
20 manner, but lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining
21 allegations in paragraph 63, and therefore deny them.

22 64. Defendant-Intervenor lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
23 the truth of the allegations in the first sentence of paragraph 64 and therefore deny them. Defendant-
24 Intervenor admit that Air Quality Management Districts regulate air quality pursuant to delegation
25 from the State of California.

26 65. Defendant-Intervenor lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
27 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 65 and therefore deny them.
28

1 66. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
2 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 66 and therefore deny them.

3 67. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
4 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 67 and therefore deny them.

5 68. The allegations in paragraph 68 are characterizations of the ESA Report and City
6 Council's administrative record. Those documents speak for themselves and are the best evidence of
7 their contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these allegations.

8 69. Defendant-Intervenors admit the first sentence of paragraph 69, and admit that
9 BAAQMD has some regulatory authority over air pollution from non-vehicular sources.

10 70. The allegations in paragraph 70 characterize the ESA Report. That document speaks
11 for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these
12 allegations.

13 71. The allegations in paragraph 71 are conclusions of law to which no response is
14 required. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the
15 allegations.

16 72. The allegations in paragraph 72 are characterizations of BAAQMD regulations. The
17 regulations speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their contents; accordingly, Defendant-
18 Intervenors deny these allegations.

19 73. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
20 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 73 and therefore deny them. To the extent that the
21 allegations in paragraph 73 characterize BAAQMD regulations, the regulations speak for themselves
22 and are the best evidence of their contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these
23 allegations.

24 74. The allegations in paragraph 74 are characterizations of BAAQMD regulations. The
25 regulations speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their contents; accordingly, Defendant-
26 Intervenors deny these allegations.

27 75. Defendant-Intervenors admit that storage domes and enclosed conveyors are
28 occasionally used in coal and petcoke facilities, but deny the remaining allegations in the first

1 sentence of paragraph 75. The remaining allegations in paragraph 75 characterize the ESA Report.
2 That document speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-
3 Intervenor deny these allegations.

4 76. Defendant-Intervenor deny the allegations in paragraph 76.

5 77. Defendant-Intervenor lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
6 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 77 and therefore deny them. To the extent that the
7 allegations in paragraph 77 characterize the ESA Report and City Council's administrative record,
8 those documents speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their contents; accordingly,
9 Defendant-Intervenor deny these allegations.

10 78. Defendant-Intervenor lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
11 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 78 and therefore deny them. To the extent that the
12 allegations in paragraph 78 characterize the ESA Report and City Council's administrative record,
13 those documents speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their contents; accordingly,
14 Defendant-Intervenor deny these allegations.

15 79. The allegations in paragraph 79 characterize the ESA Report and City Council's
16 administrative record. Those documents speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their
17 contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenor deny these allegations.

18 80. Defendant-Intervenor admit the first sentence of paragraph 80. The remaining
19 allegations in paragraph 80 characterize the ESA Report. That document speaks for itself and is the
20 best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenor deny these allegations.

21 81. Paragraph 81 contains conclusions of law that require no response. To the extent a
22 response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenor deny the allegations.

23 82. The allegations in paragraph 82 characterize the ESA Report. That document speaks
24 for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenor deny these
25 allegations.

26 83. Defendant-Intervenor admit that railcar covers and/or surfactants can possibly
27 reduce some coal dust emissions. The remaining allegations in paragraph 83 characterize the ESA
28

1 Report. That document speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly,
2 Defendant-Intervenors deny these allegations.

3 84. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 84.

4 85. The allegations in paragraph 85 characterize the ESA Report. That document speaks
5 for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these
6 allegations.

7 86. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
8 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 86 and therefore deny them.

9 a. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a
10 belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 86(a) and therefore deny
11 them.

12 b. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a
13 belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 86(b) and therefore deny
14 them.

15 c. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a
16 belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 86(c) and therefore deny
17 them.

18 d. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a
19 belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 86(d) and therefore deny
20 them.

21 e. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a
22 belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 86(e) and therefore deny
23 them.

24 87. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
25 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 87 and therefore deny them.

26 88. The allegations in paragraph 88 characterize the ESA Report. That document speaks
27 for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these
28 allegations.

1 89. The allegations in paragraph 89 characterize the ESA Report. That document speaks
2 for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these
3 allegations.

4 90. The allegations in paragraph 90 characterize the ESA Report and City Council's
5 administrative record. Those documents speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their
6 contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these allegations.

7 91. The allegations in paragraph 91 characterize the ESA Report. That document speaks
8 for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these
9 allegations.

10 92. The allegations in paragraph 92 characterize the ESA Report. That document speaks
11 for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these
12 allegations.

13 93. The first sentence of paragraph 93 characterizes the ESA report. That document
14 speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny
15 these allegations. Defendant-Intervenors deny the second sentence of paragraph 93.

16 94. The first sentence of paragraph 94 characterizes the ESA report. That document
17 speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny
18 these allegations. Defendant-Intervenors deny the second sentence of paragraph 94.

19 95. The first two sentences of paragraph 95 characterize the ESA Report and City
20 Council's administrative record. Those documents speak for themselves and are the best evidence of
21 their contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these allegations. Defendant-Intervenors
22 deny the last sentence of paragraph 95.

23 96. The allegations in paragraph 96 characterize the Staff Report. That document speaks
24 for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these
25 allegations.

26 97. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
27 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 97 and therefore deny them.
28

1 98. Defendant-Intervenors admit that Zoe Chafe was retained to prepare a report.
2 Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the
3 remaining allegations in paragraph 98 and therefore deny them.

4 99. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 99.

5 100. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
6 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 100 and therefore deny them.

7 101. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
8 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 101 and therefore deny them.

9 102. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
10 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 102 and therefore deny them.

11 103. The allegations in paragraph 103 characterize the Chafe Report. That document
12 speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny
13 these allegations.

14 104. The allegations in paragraph 104 characterize the Chafe Report. That document
15 speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny
16 these allegations.

17 105. The allegations in paragraph 105 characterize the Chafe Report. That document
18 speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny
19 these allegations.

20 106. The allegations in paragraph 106 characterize the Chafe Report. That document
21 speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny
22 these allegations.

23 107. The allegations in paragraph 107 characterize the Chafe Report. That document
24 speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny
25 these allegations.

26 108. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 108.

27 109. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
28 the truth of the allegations in the first sentence of paragraph 109 and therefore deny them. The

1 remaining allegations in paragraph 109 characterize the Chafe Report and City Council's
2 administrative record. Those documents speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their
3 contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these allegations.

4 110. The allegations in paragraph 110 characterize the Chafe Report. That document
5 speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny
6 these allegations.

7 111. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 111.

8 112. The allegations in paragraph 112 characterize the Chafe Report. That document
9 speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny
10 these allegations.

11 113. The allegations in paragraph 113 characterize the Chafe Report. That document
12 speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny
13 these allegations.

14 114. The allegations in paragraph 114 characterize the Chafe Report and City Council's
15 administrative record. Those documents speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their
16 contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these allegations. Defendant-Intervenors deny
17 that the Secretary of Transportation has designated coal as safe for transportation.

18 115. The allegations in paragraph 115 characterize the Chafe Report. That document
19 speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny
20 these allegations.

21 116. The allegations in paragraph 116 characterize the Ordinance and Resolution. Those
22 documents speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their contents; accordingly, Defendant-
23 Intervenors deny these allegations.

24 117. The allegations in paragraph 117 characterize the Ordinance and Resolution. Those
25 documents speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their contents; accordingly, Defendant-
26 Intervenors deny these allegations.

27 118. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in the first sentence of paragraph 118. The
28 remaining allegations in paragraph 118 characterize the ESA Report and City Council's

1 administrative record. Those documents speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their
2 contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these allegations.

3 119. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in the first sentence of paragraph 119. The
4 second sentence of paragraph 119 characterizes the ESA report. That document speaks for itself and
5 is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these allegations.

6 120. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
7 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 120 and therefore deny them.

8 a. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a
9 belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 120(a) and therefore deny
10 them.

11 b. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a
12 belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 120(b) and therefore deny
13 them.

14 c. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a
15 belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 120(c) and therefore deny
16 them.

17 121. The allegations in paragraph 121 characterize the Ordinance and Resolution. Those
18 documents speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their contents; accordingly, Defendant-
19 Intervenors deny these allegations.

20 122. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
21 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 122 and therefore deny them.

22 123. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
23 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 123 and therefore deny them.

24 124. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 124.

25 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

26 125. Paragraph 125 realleges and reincorporates by reference the allegations set forth in
27 paragraphs 1 through 124 of the Complaint. Defendant-Intervenors hereby reincorporate each and
28 every answer contained in paragraphs 1 through 124 as though fully set forth herein.

1 126. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
2 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 126 and therefore deny them.

3 127. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
4 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 127 and therefore deny them.

5 128. Defendant-Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
6 the truth of the allegations in paragraph 128 and therefore deny them.

7 129. The allegations in paragraph 129 are conclusions of law to which no response is
8 required. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the
9 allegations.

10 130. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 130.

11 131. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 131.

12 132. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 132.

13 133. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 133.

14 134. The allegations in paragraph 134 are characterizations of Plaintiff's case which
15 require no response. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny
16 the allegations.

17 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

18 135. Paragraph 135 realleges and reincorporates by reference the allegations set forth in
19 paragraphs 1 through 124 of the Complaint. Defendant-Intervenors hereby reincorporate each and
20 every answer contained in paragraphs 1 through 124 as though fully set forth herein.

21 136. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 136.

22 137. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 137.

23 138. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 138.

24 139. The allegations in paragraph 139 are conclusions of law to which no response is
25 required. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the
26 allegations.

1 140. The allegations in paragraph 140 are conclusions of law to which no response is
2 required. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the
3 allegations.

4 141. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 141.

5 142. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 142.

6 143. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 143.

7 144. The allegations in paragraph 144 are conclusions of law to which no response is
8 required. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the
9 allegations.

10 145. The allegations in paragraph 145 are conclusions of law to which no response is
11 required. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the
12 allegations.

13 146. The allegations in paragraph 146 are conclusions of law to which no response is
14 required. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the
15 allegations.

16 147. The allegations in paragraph 147 are conclusions of law to which no response is
17 required. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the
18 allegations.

19 148. The allegations in paragraph 148 are conclusions of law to which no response is
20 required. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the
21 allegations.

22 149. The allegations in paragraph 149 are conclusions of law to which no response is
23 required. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the
24 allegations.

25 150. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 150.

26 151. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 151.

27 152. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 152.

154. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 154.

154. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 154.

155. The allegations in paragraph 155 are conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations.

156. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 156.

157. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegation in paragraph 157 that the Ordinance discriminates against shippers that deal in coal and petcoke; the remaining allegations in paragraph 157 are conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations.

158. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations paragraph 158.

159. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations paragraph 159.

160. The allegations in paragraph 160 are characterizations of Plaintiff's case which require no response. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

161. Paragraph 161 realleges and reincorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 124 of the Complaint. Defendant-Intervenors hereby reincorporate each and every answer contained in paragraphs 1 through 124 as though fully set forth herein.

162. The allegations in paragraph 162 are conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations. In addition, paragraph 162 purports to characterize the DA. The DA speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents; accordingly, Defendant-Intervenors deny these allegations.

163. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 163.

164. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 164.

165. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 165.

1 166. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 166.

2 167. Defendant-Intervenors deny the allegations in paragraph 167.

3 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

4 168. The remainder of Plaintiff's Complaint consists of the prayer for relief, to which no
5 response is required. To the extent a response may be deemed required, Defendant-Intervenors deny
6 that Plaintiff is entitled to the relief requested in Paragraphs A through D, or to any relief
7 whatsoever.

8 **GENERAL DENIAL**

9 169. Defendant-Intervenors deny each and every allegation of Plaintiff's Complaint not
10 expressly admitted or qualified herein.

11 **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

12 **FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

13 **(Failure to state a claim)**

14 170. Plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted under Rule
15 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

16 **SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

17 **(Lack of standing)**

18 171. Plaintiff lacks Article III standing to bring this lawsuit. Plaintiff also lacks standing to
19 pursue some or all of its claims under the Interstate Commerce Commission Termination Act, 49
20 U.S.C. § 10101–16101; the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, 49 U.S.C. §§ 5101–5127; and
21 the Shipping Act of 1984, 46 U.S.C. §§ 40101–41309.

22 **THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

23 **(Statute of limitations)**

24 172. Plaintiff has failed to meet the applicable statute of limitations to pursue some or all
25 of its claims under California Government Code section 65009(c)(1).
26
27
28

1 WHEREFORE, Defendant-Intervenors respectfully request that the Court deny Plaintiff's
2 prayer for relief, that Plaintiff takes nothing, and that the case be dismissed with prejudice.

3
4 DATED: February 16, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

5 /s/ Colin O'Brien

6 COLIN O'BRIEN, SB No. 309413

cobrien@earthjustice.org

7 ADRIENNE BLOCH, SB No. 215471

abloch@earthjustice.org

8 HEATHER M. LEWIS, SB No. 291933

9 hlewis@earthjustice.org

EARTHJUSTICE

10 50 California Street, Suite 500

San Francisco, CA 94111

11 Tel: (415) 217-2000

Fax: (415) 217-2040

12 *Attorneys for Proposed Defendant-Intervenors Sierra*
13 *Club and San Francisco Baykeeper*

14 JESSICA YARNALL LOARIE, SB No. 252282

jessica.yarnall@sierraclub.org

15 JOANNE SPALDING, SB No. 169560

joanne.spalding@sierraclub.org

16 SIERRA CLUB

2101 Webster Street, Suite 1300

17 Oakland, CA 94612

18 Tel. (415) 977-5636 / Fax. (510) 208-3140

19 DANIEL P. SELMI, SB No. 67481

DSelmi@aol.com

20 919 Albany Street

Los Angeles, CA 90015

21 Tel. (949) 922-7926 / Fax: (510) 208-3140

22 *Attorneys for Proposed Defendant-Intervenor Sierra*
23 *Club*